

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

REMO HARRISON DANIELS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-cv-680-pp

BRIAN FOSTER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO NOTIFY COURT OF
MISCONDUCT (DKT. NO. 114)**

The plaintiff is an inmate at Green Bay Correctional Institution and is representing himself. He has filed a document titled "Motion to Alarm the Court's," dkt. no. 114), which the court construed as a motion to compel, dkt. no. 116 at 5–6. He asks the court to "investigate" a situation. The defendants have responded to the motion. Dkt. No. 117.

The plaintiff states that he has asked the defendants to produce video evidence from November 1, 2016; January 16, 2017; February 7, 2017; February 17, 2017; February 18, 2017; March 11, 2017; July 27, 2017; and "other dates." Dkt. No. 114 at 2. He references another of his lawsuits, Case No. 17-cv-1080, in which the defendants produced video evidence from January 3, January 9, and January 26, 2017; February 11 and February 18, 2017; and March 11, 2017. (The defendants also have produced footage from March 11, 2017 in that case.) The plaintiff reasons that if the defendants produced video evidence in his other case, they should be able to produce it in


this one. He does not accept the defendants' contention that they don't have the footage, and he asks the court to "investigate."

The plaintiff has not explained why he needs the footage, what he believes the footage will show, or how the footage is relevant to this case. And, as implied in the prior paragraph, the defendants have asserted through their lawyers that they do not have the video footage. The defendants' attorney is an officer of the court, and is ethically obligated to be truthful with the court—a serious ethical obligation to which all attorneys are subject. The plaintiff has not given the court any reason to disbelieve the defendants when they say they don't have the footage, and there is no reason for the court to "investigate."

The court **DENIES** the plaintiff's motion to alarm the court, which the court construes as a motion to compel. Dkt. No. 114.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 16th day of May, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Pepper', is written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge